
London Thames Gateway Development Corporation

Planning Committee Meeting

Thursday, 11 February 2010, 6pm

Old Town Hall Stratford, 29 The Broadway, Stratford, E15 4BQ

Present: Cllr Conor McAuley (Chair)
Malcolm Chumbley
Alan Clark
Neil Deely
Sylvie Pierce
Richard Turner

In Attendance: John Allen – Director of Planning
Stephen Allen – Planning Development Officer
Adele Williamson – Planning Development Officer
Amanda Reid – Planning Development Officer
Nigel Hewitson – Norton Rose
Teresa Willoughby – Committee Clerk
Clive Wilding – Barking Riverside for Item 4

1. Apologies, Announcements and Declarations of Interest

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Dru Vesty and Cllr Mick McCarthy. There was a declaration of interest from Cllr Conor McAuley for agenda item 3 as he chairs the Newham Programme Board.

2. Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting 14 January 2010

LTGDC/10/PC05

- 2.1 The Committee **AGREED** the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 14 January 2010. There were no matters arising.

3. Site at Canning Town Roundabout, London E16

LTGDC/10/PC06

- 3.1 Cllr Conor McAuley left the meeting for this item and Sylvie Pierce chaired the meeting in his absence. Peter Minoletti introduced the report and informed the members of the need for this project in order to improve access for residents and regeneration for this area of Canning Town. The previous scheme was approved at the June 2009 Planning Committee

meeting. The revised proposal retains the main elements of what was previously approved, but provides various improvements particularly around landscaping and reducing land take outside of the public highway. Newham's Planning Committee endorsed support for this application last week subject to a range of conditions covered in the report. The removal of the roundabout will improve connectivity in the area and free up land for landscaping and development as well as improving the setting for the Town Centre project

- 3.2 One member was concerned about TfL's comments contained in paragraph 6.11 of the report and stressed that TfL's support is fundamental to the success of the project. Peter Minoletti noted that TfL has (page 11 of the report) expressed that there is no problem in principle, but he explained that there will be some issues that will need to be resolved. The grant of planning permission alone would not allow the development to proceed as it would require TfL approval as highway authority as a separate issue, so the applicant would have to resolve TfL's concerns before proceeding.
- 3.3 The Committee, by unanimous vote, **APPROVED** the application subject to conditions outlined at Section 12 of the report. Members also confirmed, as per paragraph 11.2 of the report, that they had taken into account the environmental information as required by Regulation 3 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 and agreed that this be duly recorded on the LB Newham Statutory Register.

4. Barking Riverside, Barking Reach, Renwick Road, Barking

LTGDC/10/PC07

- 4.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the report and provided background to the project. The report relates to a reserved matters application for the details of the neighbourhood centre in Stage 1 of the Barking Riverside project. An addendum report was circulated at the meeting along with some further illustrations of the scheme. In addition to the first houses being built, this centre will deliver a range of community facilities plus 93 flats. There will be a primary school, place of worship, adult services and health provision, a café, shops, police unit, a landscaped public square, and a CHP building which includes a clock tower feature plus parking and service areas. The proposed centre is consistent with the approved masterplan.
- 4.2 The Committee discussed the project and asked about maintenance provision as none was mentioned in paragraph 8.7.11. Peter Minoletti advised that currently Barking Riverside has a dowry to pay for maintenance, and going forward, a management company would be appointed for these issues. On page 9 of the report, it should be noted that the wording of the Officer Note (no. 2) "It is unlikely that the residential units will have a view of the play area" should read "will not have a view of the play area".

- 4.3 There was an in-depth discussion on the lack of parking included in the scheme. Members of the Committee felt that if there was not enough parking available at the school it would be difficult to recruit teachers who will most likely drive in from the Essex area. Also, with a lack of parking near the shops, they could be under-utilised by the local residents. The Committee was also concerned about the narrow area for prams/cycles in the landscaped area. The limited car parking, it was felt, could lead to more people arriving by bicycle leading to a need for larger cycle lanes as well as more bike stands.
- 4.4 The Committee felt that, overall, this is a good scheme, but agreed that, in order to create in the long term a new area for London with restraint-led reductions in car use, short term temporary measures would need to be added to the scheme to make it viable.
- 4.5 Clive Wilding, representing the applicant, was invited to address the meeting to deal with the Committee's concerns. He emphasised flexibility within the scheme and that this centre is a local neighbourhood centre, not the larger main centre, which will come later in the programme. He noted that the parking strategy is included in the main permission for the site under the transportation strategy. The Committee still did not find comfort in his explanation for the lack of parking for the school. Mr Wilding commented that amendment to the S106 agreement would be required to change the parking provision.
- 4.6 The Committee was concerned about the servicing arrangements for the shops as shown in Appendix 6 of the report because it looked different in Appendix 4 which looked like a landscaped tree area. Peter Minoletti clarified that it was indeed the servicing area. The Committee agreed that more work would need to be done on the parking issue and Peter Minoletti agreed that a condition would be added for the provision of additional parking in the area on a temporary basis to satisfy the Chair's comments on school parking.
- 4.7 The Committee **AGREED** that (1) planning permission should be granted subject to conditions in the report (para 12) and an additional condition requiring the submission and approval of details of additional temporary parking; and (2) that the Director of Planning be given delegated authority to approve the details submitted and modify, add, or delete conditions as necessary.

5. **206-214 High Street, Stratford, E15 2JA**

LTGDC/10/PC08

- 5.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the proposal for Newling UK Ltd to redevelop the site at 206-214 High Street, Stratford and build a 26 storey tower providing private and affordable housing with the bottom three storeys being commercial space. Amenity space is provided by balconies/winter gardens and semi-private/communal space on the second floor roof of the rotunda. The scheme would make a positive contribution to the appearance of the High Street.

- 5.2 The Committee members discussed various points about the development. In particular, with regard to English Heritage's comment about how to prevent piecemeal development of sites that could cause a disjointed appearance. Peter Minoletti noted that this is covered in the Design and Public Realm strategy for the High Street. The Committee asked if Park Lane is a private road and will it be controlled. Peter Minoletti advised that it is public highway, but there are currently bollards on the road to stop rat-running of vehicles. It would become one way and there will be pedestrian access incorporated on the road.
- 5.3 Design details were regarded as being critical. It was requested that under Condition B1 the scale of plans required be 1:20 with key details at 1:5.
- 5.4 The Committee **RESOLVED** to give delegated authority to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to referral to the Mayor, and the S106 agreement and conditions outlined in paragraphs 11 and 12 of the report, with the amendment to Condition B1 set out at 5.3 (above).
- 6. Kwik Fit Euro Ltd, 1-4 Park Lane, Stratford E15 2JG** *LTGDC/10/PC09*
- 6.1 Peter Minoletti introduced the proposal. Lightbanner (Stratford) Ltd has submitted an application to redevelop the site to provide an 11 storey, 188 bedroom hotel with associated facilities including ground floor restaurant. Redevelopment of the site will enhance the appearance of the area. A local resident, Ms. Ali (in attendance at the meeting) objected on four grounds set out in the report (section 7). Mr Peter Thair, planning consultant for the applicant, provided the response at the meeting to Ms. Ali's concerns and explained the need for quality, budget accommodation in the area and that the issue of the bus stop to which she referred does not relate to the site. Peter Minoletti also responded in detail to each of Ms Ali's objections. The Committee raised the point about the building alignment of the scheme in relation to others on the High Street and the affect on public realm. Peter Minoletti responded that there have been discussions about building lines and uniformity and the need to respond to functionality. The Committee would also like to see the materials that will be used for the exterior of the building in order to ensure it meets the standards for the High Street public realm works. Peter Minoletti informed the Committee that on page 19 of the report, a condition (B1) requires the details of materials to be submitted and there are provisions (page 13) to have some say in how the building will be finished and still keep within the hotel's corporate design. There is no dispute that it has to fit in with the rest of the High Street. The Committee also felt that as this is a tall building, they would like to see the detailed plans at a 1:20 and 1:5 scale as per the previous item.
- 6.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to give delegated authority to the Director of Planning to grant planning permission subject to referral to the Mayor and the S106 agreement and conditions outlined in sections 11 and 12 of the report with the change to Condition B1 outlined above. The Committee **REQUESTED** that they would like to see samples of the building materials when submitted.

7. Emerging Planning Policy in the Lower Lea Valley: Hackney Wick area Action Plan (Phase 1) *LTGDC/10/PC10*

- 7.1 John Allen introduced the report which set out the Corporation's proposed response to consultation on the draft Hackney Wick Area Action Plan (Phase 1).
- 7.2 The Committee discussed the report and noted that whilst an informative document, it is more about people, and lacks information on the ability to move goods about the area in the future. Movement of goods in the area (commercial/residential) should be included in the Plan.
- 7.3 The Committee **AGREED** that the Director of Planning respond to the consultation with comments set out in the report and the additional one relating to the movement of goods.

8. Review of Scheme of Delegation relating to decision making on planning applications *LTGDC/10/PC11*

- 8.1 John Allen introduced the report which reviewed the operation of the existing scheme of delegation on planning matters to the Director of Planning, the Planning Development Manager and Chief Executive.
- 8.2 The Committee **AGREED** to the revised Scheme of Delegation attached at Appendix 2 to the report with a further review of the scheme scheduled for February 2011.

9. S106 Planning Obligations Monitoring Quarterly Report *LTGDC/10/PC12*

- 9.1 John Allen introduced the report which provides a quarterly update on the Section 106 agreements (S106) that the Development Corporation has agreed and signed in the third quarter of 2009/10.
- 9.2 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report.

10. Planning Performance Monitoring Quarterly Report *LTGDC/10/PC13*

- 10.1 John Allen introduced the third quarterly report of 2009-2010 to advise members of the performance of the Corporation's development control function. The Committee was impressed with the Corporation's performance to date.
- 10.2 The Committee **NOTED** the contents of the report.

The meeting concluded at 7:35pm

Date of next meeting:

Thursday 21 April 2010, 6pm

Old Town Hall Stratford, 29 The Broadway, Stratford, E15 4BQ